

The North Carolina Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY
WILLIAM W. HOLDEN,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES—THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALEIGH, N. C. WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 1844.

VOLUME X.—NUMBER 488.
TERMS—\$3 PER ANNUM,
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

TERMS.

THE NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE.

Those persons who remit by Mail (postage paid) Five Dollars, will be entitled to a receipt for Six Dollars, or two years' subscription to the Standard—one copy two years, or two copies one year.

For four copies, \$10 00
" ten " 20 00
" twenty " 35 00

The same rate for six months.

Any person procuring and forwarding five subscribers, with the cash (\$15), will be entitled to the Standard one year free of charge.

ADVERTISEMENTS, not exceeding fourteen lines, will be inserted one time for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion;—those of greater length, in proportion. *Count Orders and Judicial Advertisements* will be charged twenty-five per cent. higher than the above rates. A deduction of 33 1-3 per cent. will be made to those who advertise by the year. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out. Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

Twenty-eighth Congress—First Session.

REMARKS OF MR. WOODBURY,
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,

In Senate, February 7 and 8, 1844.—On the resolution to postpone indefinitely Mr. McDuffie's bill to reduce the present tariff.

(CONTINUED.)

Franklin, in this country as we have already seen, says that high duties on the importation enables the manufacturer to tax the home consumer by greater prices. He could draw lightning from the clouds, but he could, with all his ingenuity and skill, draw no other conclusion than this from high duties. It may be sometimes true, as an exception, that in a glut of the market the importer may not be able to sell at an enhanced price, and must then sell at a loss, if at all. Every one can see, however, that this is only temporary and occasional. For a new high duty, which, as the senator from Maine supposes, may at first raise prices, and thus check sales, will if they afterwards fall, from the market being overstocked, bring them at once up again as soon as the supply is less and the manufacturer less, as is usual after such a glut. This brief fall in price, too, whenever it happens, will, for a like season, cause a corresponding fall in the price of the agricultural production to be exchanged for the manufacture; and, in that case, it will require no prophesies, rather than benefits the producer. The action of every body in daily life contradicts the whole position on the other side, that, as a general principle, prices are permanently reduced by higher duties; or why do persons, after high duties, smuggle? If they make the prices here lower, the smuggling will be the other way. Why, also, are our tables loaded with memorials asking for drawbacks or to remit duties on railroad iron, if they make its prices lower? Why do nations ever retaliate against others by imposing higher duties, if it makes their articles lower, and hence more in demand for consumption? Indeed, why do the manufacturers themselves ask for higher duties on the manufactured articles, if the price is not thereby increased? And why ask for low duties, or entire freedom to the raw material, if it be not thereby made lower? And why oppose a reduction, as now, if that reduction would not tend to reduce prices? What, sir, I have not the resolution of the high-tariff legislature of Vermont, just offered here, to continue the present high duties on wool? And why is this, except that, in their opinion, frankly admitted, the price of that great staple with them has been thereby enhanced? The whole misconception, beyond the slight temporary exceptions before alluded to, appeared to rise from what undoubtedly was a fact in this country, that most manufactured articles had fallen throughout the world since high duties had begun to be imposed, in 1816. But, in the first place, a fall in many of these commenced before 1816; in the next place, every sequence was not a consequence; every thing after an event did not happen on account of it, or we might attribute this fall to the war of 1812, or the great eclipse of 1806, as the fall has occurred after both. In cases like these, we must probe to the bottom and evict the true causes and consequences of events, and not virtually take up the irrational, if not absurd idea, that high national taxes of any kind are a blessing, any more than that a great national debt is a national blessing.

It was, on some accounts, perhaps, unfortunate that this notion had not been discovered earlier; when our fathers considered themselves so much oppressed by a higher tax on tea, and when the French so grievously complained and rebelled against the *gabelle*, or high salt tax—none of them being so long sighted then as to dream that the prices were thereby reduced. But seriously Mr. President, if any still doubt on this subject, let them look a little into the cautious and well-considered work on prices, which I hold in my hand, by Tooke, (edition of 1838), not swollen with loose theories, but facts—recorded and authentic facts—giving the history and causes of the fluctuations in prices in England during the last half century. It never entered his imagination, because they rose generally from 1795 to 1815, and fell generally from 1815 to 1842, that this proceeded at all from lower duties in the first period, or higher ones in the second. The fact as to duties was in most cases directly the reverse. No, sir, the true and general causes of a fall in prices are, first a greater quantity of the article produced, without a greater demand; whether produced in agriculture by more fertile seasons, better manures or tools; or in manufactures by improved machinery, with chemical discoveries; or in both, by more hands released from war and other unproductive employments, and devoted to either of those pursuits. And secondly, by a contraction of the amount of the currency, whether paper or specie, by which the value of these, or an addition to the tax or expense in making the article, or the opening of new and better markets. Hence, if a fall occurs from one of the first causes, it would be still greater if none of the last intervene to counteract it in any degree—such as a higher duty, an expansion in the currency, or a new market. But these last may, and do in some cases, not counteract it entirely; and then the cry is, that the higher duty lowers the price, when in fact the other causes exist and lower it; and would make it lower still, but for the higher duty.

How unphilosophical it is, likewise, when good, pertinent, and long-established causes exist to lower prices, to hunt for another cause, not certain or rational, and conjure that up as the true one.

But enough on the reasoning connected with this fallacy, so wide, and so pervading the ranks of the friends of high protection, and which, if removed, the whole fabric must totter to its base. How are the recorded facts no less than the reasoning? Not a single case here and there, and for a month or a year; but how, on both continents, and for a long series of years, and as to numerous articles? I have before me various schedules of prices current, both in England and America. They all show conclusively that since 1765, from the causes first named, agricultural products in England have generally risen though the highest duties have been imposed there for their protection—they, rather than manufactures, being the pets or favorites for protection with the great landed gentry and aristocracy, that fill the two Houses of Parliament. At the same time, they show that, from the first named causes, and especially improvements in machinery and in chemistry, manufactures have fallen in price—and this when the duty was low, as well as when high.

Indeed, the difference between the official and real valuation of exports there, which indicates on the public and authentic records the changes in price since 1690, shows that the whole, from various causes, have fallen in the aggregate something like 58 per cent. The writer before me says:

"We have taken out of the lists of exports the leading articles of agricultural produce for three years, (1840, 1841, 1842), the value of which we find would have been, in 1694, (one hundred and fifty years ago), £1,557,993; but which have now increased to a value of £3,778,321, being an advance in price of 143 per cent."

"We have also taken out some of the leading articles of manufactures for the same time, the value of which we find would have been, in 1694, £267,936,717; but which are now reduced to a value of £107,173,382, being a reduction of price of 60 per cent. Thus showing that, while manufactured goods and minerals have fallen considerably more than a half, agricultural produce has much more than doubled its value."

"Butter and cheese have risen in price, during that period, 193 per cent."

"Corn, flour, &c. have risen 161 per cent."

"Cows have risen in price 209 per cent."

"Horses have risen in price 267 per cent."

"Wool has risen in price 169 per cent."

"While cotton manufactures have fallen in price, during that period, 73 per cent."

"Coals have fallen in price 60 per cent."

"Iron and steel have fallen in price 45 per cent."

"Linen manufactures have fallen in price 36 per cent."

"And, what is very curious, while wool has risen 169 per cent. woollen manufactures have fallen 10 per cent in price."—*Economist*, November 4, 1843.

In the United States, prices current in Boston and New York, for a long series of years, as to numerous articles, have likewise been examined. They show a general fall in price here of agricultural articles, not prevented entirely even under an expanded currency in 1814 and 1836. But this fall has occurred from great and cheap production, on our cheap and fertile, and extensive soil; and could not happen from high protective duties, they having been low on such agricultural products as are much imported, or entirely free on several of them.

These tables showed, further, a fall in some manufactured articles where the duties ranged high, and in others where low. But this fall manifestly happened from improvements in machinery and steam, (the great and distinguishing features of the age), or from new mines opened; and in spite of high duties rather than being their consequences. Think you, sir, that a minimum duty on cottons here has caused the fall in their price in Great Britain and America, rather than the inventions of Arkwright in spinning, or Cartwright in weaving, or Watts in steam, any more than the duty here on the raw material has caused its fall two-thirds, rather than the wonderful cotton gin of Whitney, and our exuberant soil? The tables compiled from McCulloch, Tooke, and the prices current in New York, are at the service of any senator. I shall not repeat their details; but merely state as most striking refutations of the theory on the other side, that in England, the manufactured article of saltpetre has fallen more than most others, viz: from 31 shillings per hundred weight in 1795, to 21 shillings in 1838, *though on a low duty*; and log-wood from 11 shillings per ton to 7, *though free*; and salt from 6 shillings, and during war 19 shillings, to only 1 shilling and 3 pence, in 1838, *though then entirely free*. The first was manifestly caused by improvements in chemistry, and new discoveries; and the two last, as in this country, from new and greater supplies combined with lower duties there, and in spite of high ones here on the great commodity of life.

The tables in 2d Tooke, 390 p. (edition 1838), show further that the price of timber has risen under a rising duty, and tobacco not risen nor fallen, though taxed with a duty computed by the chairman at 2,000 per cent. One would suppose the last high enough, on his theory, to make the price fall next to nothing.

Here plaster of Paris, though free, and not a manufacture, has fallen as much or more than others, viz: from \$20 per ton in 1811 to only \$2 25 in 1844; and, of course, from other causes than high duties. Indeed, out of two hundred and sixteen articles on which prices had fallen, some years since—as large a number were ascertained by the late inquisitive Condy Raguet to be such as were free or on a low duty, as on a high—thus indicating, with unerring certainty, the great and general operation of other causes. All can remember how the price of sugar fell a few years ago here under a falling duty, and how it has risen again like the Vermont wool, cordage and cottons, under a higher duty. Not that all articles are falling or rising in all cases, entirely from the change in duty, but always higher than they would otherwise would be if a duty exists, and lower than they otherwise would be if one does not exist. Indeed, the great advocate of the protective system (Mr. Clay), at last virtually conceded away this whole ground in 1832; by expressing a willingness to reduce several of the high duties so as to relieve the consumption of the country; but which could not be thus relieved unless high duties had made prices higher—proving in these ways, the position that prices of articles are usually made higher to the extent of the duty. It then follows that the consumer of such articles

is usually obliged to pay as much more for them on that account. Such is the plain common sense of the case. Such is the doctrine of all the leading economists abroad, as well as of Franklin; and Mr. Hamilton was forced to admit that this was the case, and when not so, the increase fell on the merchant, and was still more ruinous to him. Mr. Dallas entertained a like idea. And it can never fall on the foreign producer any longer than to affect his present stock in a few cases, till he reduces his production, and thus prevents a glut.

It then follows that, as a general principle, the enhanced price of the foreign article, and also of the domestic article, is paid by the consumer. This, we have already shown, equals here now, beyond a fair revenue, about forty-three millions of dollars yearly; and as the manufactures constitute but one-eleventh of the whole, ten-elevenths of it is paid by other consumers, and for the benefits of that one-eleventh. As most of these others belong to the agricultural classes, they being near three-fourths of all our population, the great mass of this enormous burden is thrown on them, and must induce them in time, as the real facts are well understood, to demolish the whole system of partial protection, and require, as some of us do now, that a tariff for such protection be corrected, without unnecessary delay. What does it amount to per head yearly, including their families? Over two dollars to each man, woman and child, on an average. What, in the gross, are the present duties on a few separate articles of great, vital, and universal necessity? On iron, at 25 lbs per head, it is 500,000,000 lbs. for our whole population, now twenty millions of people; and the tax on this, at only three cents per pound, is fifteen millions of dollars, ten-elevenths of which is paid by others than the manufacturers. On sugar, at 14 pounds per head, at 23 cents duty per pound, the tax is seven millions of dollars more; and on salt alone, without going into other articles; it is, at a bushel per head, quite a million and a half of dollars.

As an illustration how this presses on my own State, with a population of about 300,000, and the large mass of them farmers, the tax for iron alone equals \$225,000, or four times the amount of the whole State tax; on sugar \$109,000 more; and on salt \$24,000—making, on only three articles, an aggregate of more than a third of a million, and near seven times the whole of what is technically our State tax. None of our population get these articles as much as they consume. All can see at a moment, how this prevents the consumer from being able to buy, or enjoy, or lay up so much, with the same money and means, as he otherwise could; for, by the rise of price, he gets but three or four pounds of iron, sugar, &c. for the same money or value of produce, where before he got five, the cost of the difference going to the manufacturer and the revenue. The whole Union, as consumers, and, so far as not makers of such articles, feel the discriminating oppression, and are thus, in the North as well as the South, the East and the Middle States, as well as the great West, all suffering under its unequal bearing by means of the present tariff.

But look at another aspect of the inquiry, as affecting the producing classes. The producer is usually a farmer, or planter or manufacturer; though those connected with the last class are only about a million and a half to twelve millions and three fourths connected with the two former. Now, if the producer has to pay forty per cent. more on many indispensable articles which he consumes, it will soon be manifest that unless a manufacturer, and thus indemnified, he suffers doubly under this system, and especially as compared with any other consumer.

I shall not now enter into any technical reasoning about what is called the *forty-bale theory*; though it would be troublesome to defeat by argument the cogent reasoning of the senator before me, [Mr. McDuffie]. But this much is demonstrable, that such producers are first burdened and injured by the higher price of what they consume. Whether they purchase it here with money, or bring it home in exchange for what they produce and send abroad, the consequence is the same, that they get less in amount for consumption; and when it is argued that, in such a case, they had better not use foreign articles so raised in price, but bring home money, pray what is to be done with the money?—not eaten nor worn, but some of it exchanged here for necessities or luxuries; and whether of domestic or foreign manufacture, enhanced in price so that he cannot procure or enjoy so many of them. It is this extensive *taxation* in all possible ways, on the producer in England, that tempts Parliament to continue the corn-law duties, with a view to remunerate the agriculturist; by higher prices, thus caused for his great staples. And yet, after all that, having, as he has almost, a monopoly of food, he grinds the laborer into riots and incendiarism; while the manufacturer, not so much the pet there, works so near the minimum price necessary to sustain life, that a bad harvest, and rise in food, or a rise in cotton, and a glut of markets, so as to diminish manufacturing, throws millions upon public charity for their daily bread. Much of those trying evils arise from excessive taxation, in various ways, and especially high duties on corn—some bearing on one kind of produce, and some on another, and all fall there on the humiliated laborer, whether engaged in manufacture or agriculture. The relief there, as well as here, is the great problem; and it is to be found in reducing, and not raising, taxation, and furnishing both bread and clothing, as well as all other materials, each from the places where they can, in the present state of society, and without forced means, be made cheapest. Then, God's bounties in every climate and stage of improvement in society, will, by commerce, become interchanged and universally diffused; and the whole human family be blessed, rather than oppressed, by each other's advantages and excellencies.

Proceed, then, and lower the highest duties here, and the revenue would still be sufficient; and other things remaining unchanged, the laborer, as well as producer, will be able to consume not only as much more as the difference of duty would buy, but industry and the prices of his own products will be so increased to the producer that he will be able to buy much more. A most memorable instance of a change in this respect occurred in the case of coffee in England, of which, under a high duty of 2s. 6d. per lb. in 1824, when foreign, and 1s. when colonial, but 8,262,943 lbs. were consumed. But the duties being then reduced one-half, the consumption, from that and other causes, increased, by 1840, to 23,664,336 lbs. [Mr. Evans here asked if England produced any coffee; to which Mr. Woodbury replied, that she produced some in her colonies, as well as

sugar.] It is a remarkable fact, that the duties remaining high during that same period on sugar, the consumption of it fell off 377,302 cwt.

Producers are next suffering by not being able, under high duties, to purchase lands and stock, and hire labor to the extent they otherwise might, in order to increase the quantity of their produce. It is also certain, that, under this system, produce is likely to sell for less, because their markets abroad are exposed to be cut off and diminished much more than under a system of low duties and liberal reciprocity.

Thus it is that the great agricultural producers in the South and West feel so deeply the evils of this system, having little or no remuneration for them, or relief from them, as the manufacturers themselves have, and in some respects in the North, part of those living in their immediate neighborhoods. And if it were not for the low price of lands in this country, and their virgin richness, and blessed fertility, the distress and prostration, would, in past years with farmers have been much severer.

Next their markets are thus exposed to become cramped or deteriorated, under retaliations; and the great principle of trade is acknowledged now by most people, as laid down by Franklin, that commerce must, in order to flourish durably, consist of mutual exchanges. Writing to a French gentleman, he says: (vol. 5, p. 369)

"We are much pleased with the disposition of your government to favor our commerce, manifested in the late *reglement*. You appear to be possessed of a truth which few governments are possessed of—that a State must take some of B's produce; otherwise B will not be able to pay for what he would take of A."

The evil operation, naturally attendant on a high and discriminating tariff, to injure all markets abroad, is one which presses hard on the friends of such a system. And hence it is a favorite ground assumed by them, that the foreign markets are of trifling consequence to the producer, compared with the domestic or home market, and that they but little affect his prices; and that their system furnishes a demand so much better for all produced, as to atone for the loss of all markets abroad.

Now, sir, as these positions are deemed by their authors great pillars to support the protective system, I will ask your indulgence a short time in order to expose how utterly unfounded they are in the real facts applicable to them; and to show afterwards the further evils of this system to navigation and the fisheries, and even to sound manufacturing industry, no less than to the great classes of consumers and producers so as to be entirely unatoned for by any benefits really resulting from it.

[Mr. W. commenced his remarks as to its effect on our markets, but gave way, at the request of his friends, to an adjournment. The next day, after some explanations, which are inserted in their appropriate places, he proceeded.]

In pursuing this discussion further, Mr. President, in the manner I have proposed, I would be trespassing uselessly on the patience of the Senate, if my best endeavors were not exerted to elicit truth—I would try to settle contradictory opinions as to some facts, by a fuller and more dispassionate consideration of them—and, if possible, reconcile a majority to such changes in the existing tariff as are, in painful sincerity, believed by me to be necessary for the preservation of sound principles in taxation, equal justice to all, and the prosperity and peace of the country.

The idea that our foreign markets had not improved under the lowering duties from 1832 to 1842, compared with what they were the ten years previous, under higher rates, was very erroneous.

The value of domestic produce exported in 1832, was \$40,874,079, and in 1833, \$63,137,470, or an increase of only about 25 per cent. while, in 1842, the value was \$92,969,996, or an increase of near 50 per cent. If the aggregate of these exports, in all the first ten years, was compared with that of the last, the increase in the last five years would be near 100 per cent. Some had supposed that this increase had been confined to southern staples alone; but while cotton had augmented, rice and tobacco had been nearly stationary; and the great staples of the West and Middle States, and North, not consumed by the South while making the cotton, and thus obtaining a larger and better market through the cotton raised and sent abroad, such as the exports of breadstuffs, pork, lard, beef, butter and cheese, lumber, lead, and even of manufactures, have augmented.

Indeed almost the whole of the fourteen and a half millions of pounds of lead we now send to foreign markets have sprung up within the last ten years; and, as shown in the table before me, even within the last three, our exports of beef have trebled. So of pork and lard, and also of butter and cheese.

Again: An impression had, by some, been sedulously inculcated, that England took little or nothing of our domestic products for herself and her dependencies, and therefore we ought, in retaliation, to tax high her manufactures. I am not the apologist of either England or France in their ancient commercial policy, in some respects, towards this country. But it is due to historical truth and justice to admit that, of late years, they take large portions of our surplus produce, being our two greatest markets in the world.

In respect to England, when buying our productions which are not luxuries—like tobacco, standing on a peculiar and different basis—she takes them on duties not usually so high as our own, and, recently, under several reductions, which we have very ill reciprocated by the present higher tariff. Let us test, this by evidence; for I ask nothing on naked assertion. I hold in my hand statements of our exports of domestic produce to England and her dependencies in 1822, 1832, and 1842.

They increased about 24 per cent. in the first period, but over 40 per cent. in the last one; and they considerably exceed one-half of all our exports of that kind to all quarters of the globe. This is nothing as a growing advantage, by way of market, to all our producers, and to be encouraged by reciprocal liberality? especially when we recall to mind the further fact, that she takes even more of us, yearly, than we do of her, to the extent of four or five millions of dollars. Is not this such a favorable balance of trade to us, and such a large market—more than all the rest of the world—as to deserve some little regard and conciliatory spirit? Yet the policy of much of the existing tariff is, on the contrary, almost vindictive towards her chief productions. Again, as shown by my friend before me, [Mr. McDuffie], she takes of our cotton over \$30,000,000 a year—nigh two-thirds of the whole amount exported

—our greatest article sent abroad; and in which not South Carolina alone is interested, (as many affect to suppose), but still more, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, with parts of North Carolina, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Arkansas, as well as, indirectly, every other State which furnishes to them supplies, agricultural or manufactured.

Besides this, and more than one-fifth of our rice exported, she takes over one-third of the tobacco; and has always been one of our largest customers for both; thus presenting, in spite of her large duties on the last as a luxury, one of the best markets for the great production of still other States, including Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, and Missouri. But it is often alleged, that she takes little but the produce of the free States; and particularly of bread stuffs, pork, beef, &c. more directly interesting to the central States, those beyond the Alleghenies, and the agriculture, fisheries, and manufactures of the East. Fortunately, sir, when we take the trouble to scrutinize the official documents, this delusion becomes entirely dispelled.

In 1832, when we sent to England and her dependencies not one-third of all our exports of flour, wheat, corn, and other breadstuffs, her harsh system of corn laws had recently been adopted on the same high protective system in favor of her agriculture, which we ourselves have so indiscreetly introduced in the present tariff, to aid our manufacturers. But, notwithstanding the just complaints against that system, our intercourse thro' her neighboring colonies, from which the duty is lower, and our proximity to her West India islands, gradually enabled us to send to her and her dependencies, at a profit, over one-half of all those exports; and by 1842, over two-thirds of the whole; and equalling in value fifty per cent. more than all the tobacco and rice sent to them.

In fish, she takes largely of our beef, pork, and dairy; also of the products of our forest and the ocean, and even of the factory, as well as of raw cotton and grain. And her increased and increased demands for most of these, if not repulsed and thwarted by high tariffs, rendered this consideration a momentous one not only to the South, but to all the grain growing States, whether on the Atlantic, or on the rivers and lakes of the mighty West, and gave it an interest to every farmer, and fisherman, and many a mechanic, in the valleys and on the hill-tops, on the seashore and in the villages of the busy North. Without dwelling too long on details, the value of beef now taken by her is double what it was in 1832; the pork and lard near two hundred per cent. more; and the butter and cheese near six times as much. While, from our forests, she purchases near one-fourth of what we export in lumber, and six-sevenths of all our tar and other naval stores.

[Mr. Benton. Please to repeat that.]

Yes, sir. She takes quite six-sevenths of all our naval stores exported; and, though that is important to your native State, (North Carolina), another fact is becoming still more important to the State of your adoption—to Missouri—and also to Illinois, that instead of now importing of our lead from England, we supply from our own mines, on account of their natural fertility, and not by hot-bed protection, firstly our own great wants, and next send it across the equator—double, with it, both the Cape of Good Hope and Cape Horn, and supply China, as well as the Sandwich islands of the Pacific; and last, but not least, send to England herself near one-sixth of the whole we now export, while in 1832 she took not a pound, and in 1833 but \$22 worth.

From our fisheries she takes, also, half the sperm oil we export, instead of nothing in 1832, and but a pittance in 1833. But let me ask the gentleman on the other side, if even the manufacturers would be quite as well situated as to a market for their eight or nine millions of exports, if England and her dependencies were not open to many of them? She has admitted even our cotton manufactures into India, and some of them were used to help to clothe the very troops that marched to Afghanistan. She takes an increasing quantity of our domestic salt in Canada; from one to two hundred thousand dollars' worth of our nails in her West Indies; more and more of our sperm and tallow candles; a third of a million of our manufactures from tobacco; and very considerable portions of the soap, leather, shoes, boots, &c., &c., which help to swell the exports of our domestic manufactures.

But not to be tedious on this point, mark the contrast also in the present rate of her duties on many of these articles. On the greatest (cotton) only 7 1/2 per cent.; on lard, only 5 per cent.; on wheat into Canada, only 7 cents per bushel; on beef and pork, but 2 cents a pound; and cheese, but 24 cents. This will not be much over 20 per cent. on the whole of them, and some calculations have been enabled to push her average duties higher on articles which we raise, only by including tobacco, which is taxed high there as a luxury, and to bear on the rich; and some other articles, as spirits and cider, which could not fairly be taken into the account, we ship so little of them to England, any more than cotton cloths, though only taxed 15 per cent.; woollens but 10 per cent.; linen 15 per cent.; and iron but 8 per cent.

Embracing corn, and their higher duty on our direct export of it to England, the average rate on the first class of articles would not rise to 25 per cent., as wheat, at the average price there, pays only about 30 or 32 per cent. duty, ranging lower or higher by a sliding scale, as the price there may rise or fall. To show what great advances she had recently made in relaxing her restrictive policy, by reducing her duties on articles which were high, and many of which greatly interest us, I have her old and new tariffs before me, and have placed several instances in parallel columns for convenience in reference, if any senator chooses to examine the matter further.

Perhaps one reason, among others, why the corn duties have not been more relaxed, is the continued high discrimination which we still persist in against manufactured articles, such as she produces. And, as those duties there are a great engine of wrong and suffering towards starving millions, and help to fill her almshouses and prisons—leading to barn-burning, and mobs, and thefts, for vengeance or existence—there is little doubt that a relaxation there is desirable to many others, as well as the tolling millions; and that reciprocal legislation by us, in the spirit of her last tariff, would help to hasten a further reduction, and open a much larger vent for our grain and meats, at enhanced prices. A reciprocal arrangement of such a character can be effected by legislation, as well, if not better, than by treaty. The two countries are, in truth, fitted to consume largely of each other's surplus, sold by each (as it is) at cheaper rates than it can be produced by the other—she selling her manufactures of cotton cheaper, by machinery, skill, capital, and low

wages; we, our cotton, grain, meats, and other materials, cheaper than hers, in consequence of a soil costing less and producing more, as well as being more lightly taxed. Nature and circumstances fit us both for mutual interchange, on mutual low duties, to the mutual advantage of both, as much as do the tastes and formation of the two sexes suit them for each other's happiness. She needs, even on the present limited consumption, near two million quarters of wheat yearly from abroad. This alone gives a market for a quantity equal to the sixteen million surplus bushels of Ohio; and, if we supplied the whole, though at the reduced price of \$1 25 per bushel, when the average in England is \$1 75, it would be a gain of near four millions yearly. But the quantity consumed would be greatly increased by a reduction in the duty and price. The quantity taken beyond what is now taken, beside great additions to the meats, might reasonably be estimated at forty or fifty millions of bushels—a considerable portion of which we could furnish, as well as the north of Europe.

[Mr. Huntington inquired if Mr. W. estimated our crop of grain at only fifty millions of bushels, or stated that England took two-thirds of it all.]

By no means, sir. The whole crop exceeds five hundred millions of bushels, including all the grains, and exceeds eighty-four millions of wheat alone; and England, of course, takes only two-thirds of all we send abroad. I have not been talking of a market abroad for all our agricultural productions, as those alone equal from six to eight hundred millions of dollars yearly; but of their surplus. Those productions—after supplying the wants of fifteen or sixteen millions of people engaged in or connected with the production of them, and three or four millions more connected with commerce and other pursuits—yield a surplus of near one hundred millions of dollars in value; and, as that finds abundant and high markets abroad, or otherwise, it affects the sales and prices of all which is transferred from producers to consumers at home, and serves to enrich or impoverish the whole country. The present tariff, I have shown, tends to drive us from the best foreign markets for the disposal of those surplus products; to lessen the number of those markets, as well as their demands, by provoking duties against us which are higher, and more embarrassing and injurious, by way of retaliation. It tends to injure us not only in England and France, but in Germany also, where the tariff usually does not exceed twenty per cent., and in Prussia is intended to be kept down still lower; and where, as in South America and Asia—great and growing markets for many of our productions—the imports are light, compared with our own.

Doing all we can by negotiation to correct inequalities against us elsewhere, let us, then, in the true and redeeming spirit of morals and sound legislation, proceed to do right ourselves in respect to the tariff—to set a good example of revenue duties—and then urge with effect, as we may, in England and France no less than Germany, a reciprocal liberality, in all such cases as are not now mutual, or are not precluded by a local policy as to luxuries.

But if other nations should not at once meet our reduction in duties, by corresponding ones on their part, we shall still, though ill requited by foreigners, be gainers from our own moderation, under the great principle that all consumers here will, by our reduction, pay less for what they buy from abroad; and the producers here will be better able to compete with others in the markets of the whole world, and will sell more, and will make more money on what they do sell, as the production of it here, under lower duties on all they consume, will cost them less.

The only rainbow which now tinges the gloom, is the hope that the tariff of 1842 may become in this way mitigated, if not abandoned here, and then still more abroad, and that improved foreign markets will be thus encouraged in Europe and South America, co-operating with the vast one just forced open in China, under a duty not ranging there, on an average, so high as twenty per cent.; and through which alone we may be able to aid more in supplying a population, equal to half that of the whole human race, with whatever our mines, or manufactures, or agriculture can furnish agreeable to their taste or suitable to their wants.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

A Row in the Federal Camp. Horace Greeley, editor of the N. Y. Tribune, and James Watson Webb, editor of the Courier and Enquirer, the two acknowledged leaders of the party, are now by the ears. Which has the better, it is difficult to tell, as both have long holds. Webb says that Greeley is an egotist, a Philosopher, Fourierite, fanatic, and a fool; while he himself claims to be a Christian. Greeley retorts that Webb had better take his \$52,000, and return to Tammany Hall where he was in 1832. The Whig party can dispense with his railing services. Further he adds: "It is hard for Philosophy that so humble a man as himself shall be made to stand as its exemplar; while Christianity is personified by the hero of the Sunday duel with Hon. Tom. Marshall; but such luck will happen."

"Pistols for two!" "The Union of the Whigs for the sake of the Union!"

The blue ash tree is now the emblem of the whig party. Quite appropriate, as the only fruit they will gather at the great harvest in '44 will be ashes.

Recovery of Galileo's Manuscripts. Albeit, the distinguished Italian philosopher, has announced the discovery of some manuscripts which contain the observations made by Galileo on the satellites of Jupiter. It had been believed as a historic fact, that the officers of the Inquisition had destroyed them.

A Prolific Parish. Mr. Phillips, of Assumption, stated in debate the other day, in the Louisiana House of Representatives, that in his parish there were, on an average, twelve children to an angry family in it!

Who came first? "Hullo, steward!" exclaimed a fellow in a steamboat on the Mississippi, after he had retired to bed—"hullo, steward!" "What, massa?" "Bring me the way bill." "What for, massa?" "I want to see if these bed bugs put down their names for this berth before I did. If not—I want 'em turned out!"